

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PATTI M. PAGE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HSIEH, et al.,

Defendants.

1:21-cv-00154-JLT-GSA-PC

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS,
RECOMMENDING THAT THIS CASE
BE DISMISSED, WITHOUT
PREJUDICE, FOR PLAINTIFF'S
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER**

(ECF No. 17.)

**OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN
FOURTEEN (14) DAYS**

I. BACKGROUND

Patti M. Page ("Plaintiff") is a former state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 8, 2021, Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action. (ECF No. 1.) On November 29, 2022, the Court dismissed the Complaint for failure to state a claim with leave to amend within 30 days. (ECF No. 17.) The 30-day time period now passed and Plaintiff has not filed a First Amended Complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's order. Therefore, it will be recommended that this case be dismissed, without prejudice, for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order.

II. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER

In determining whether to dismiss this action for failure to comply with the directives set forth in its order, “the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits.” Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

“‘The public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal,’” id. (quoting Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)), and here, the action has been pending since February 8, 2021. Plaintiff’s failure to respond to the Court’s order may reflect Plaintiff’s disinterest in prosecuting this case. In such an instance, the Court cannot continue to expend its scarce resources assisting a litigant who will not comply with the court’s orders. Thus, both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

Turning to the risk of prejudice, “pendency of a lawsuit is not sufficiently prejudicial in and of itself to warrant dismissal.” Id. (citing Yourish at 991). However, “delay inherently increases the risk that witnesses’ memories will fade and evidence will become stale,” id., and it is Plaintiff’s failure to file an amended complaint that is causing delay. Therefore, the third factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

As for the availability of lesser sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court which would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Monetary sanctions in this circumstance are of little use because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro per* and *in forma pauperis*, and given the early stage of these proceedings, the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is not available. However, inasmuch as the dismissal being considered in this case is without prejudice, the Court is stopping short of issuing the harshest possible sanction of dismissal with prejudice.

Finally, because public policy favors disposition on the merits, this factor will always weigh against dismissal. Id. at 643.

///

III. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Court **HEREBY RECOMMENDS** that this case be dismissed, without prejudice, based on Plaintiff's failure to obey the Court's order issued on November 29, 2022.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within **fourteen (14) days** after the date of service of these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **January 20, 2023**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE